

Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney, Nathan Grebasch, wishes to thank Examiner Roswell for conducting a telephonic interview on February 25, 2008.

During the interviews, Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the Lum/Mical reference with reference to the amendment submitted herein. In particular, Counsel and the Examiner discussed the Mical reference and Col. 3, lines 19-25 and lines 60-68. Counsel also referenced paragraph [0095] of the present application. The Mical reference is distinguishable from the recited subject matter because Mical discloses a sub menu of choices rather than a property of the data element.

Applicant's attorney submitted a potential amendment to clarify features of the independent claims in order to facilitate prosecution and without agreeing with the Office's rejections. Applicant's attorney understood the Examiner to consider the claims as amended allowable over the art of record but indicated that the allowance of the claims is subject to an additional search.

Applicant respectfully requests a phone call if the Examiner believes there are any further issues that might delay issuance.

REMARKS

Claims 42-58 are currently pending. By this paper claims 42, 45, 50, 51 and 57 are hereby amended. Support for the amendment to claims may be found at paragraphs [0096], [0094] and [0095] and throughout the application as file. In particular paragraph [0095], in part, recites "The list manager 220 extends all display list controls by wrapping them and adding an additional property". In light of the amendment and the remarks below, reconsideration is respectfully requested and allowance is solicited.

Rejections under § 112

The rejection of claims 50 and 57 under §112 paragraph two is believed to be obviated based on the included amendment. Claims 50 and 57 have been amended to recite “forwarded events” support for the amendment in the written description is noted above. Removal of the antecedent basis rejection to claims 50 and 57 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under § 103

Claims 42-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,065,041 to Lum et al. (“Lum”), and U.S. Patent 4,772,882 to Mical (“Mical”). Applicant traverses the rejection.

As amended, Claim 42, in part recites:

- “wrap one or more display controls that are attached to the list with a property that stores a unique identifier that specifies which said data element a particular said display control is currently displaying, *the unique identifier identifying an additional property of said data element from the data source.*”

The combination of Lum/Mical fails to teach at least the above features. The rejection is improper as the Mical reference, relied on for teaching “wrapping” fails to teach or suggest a “*the unique identifier identifying an additional property of said data element from the data source*” Mical does not teach this feature because Mical is limited to teaching displaying a sub-menu rather than a property of the data element. In this manner, Mical does not provide additional property or detail about the “data element” but instead provides a submenu which is related to menu itself. For instance, the Instant Application discloses “[f]or example, a contacts application could listen to the list manager 220 for item focused events and fill in a detail pane by requesting more information from the data source 222 regarding the data element that just got

focused.” Instant Application, paragraph [0095]. The Mical reference merely discloses that the menu drawn variable may be used to indicate a related sub-menu but does not teach identifying additional property about said data element. Mical, Col. 3, lines 19-32 and 64-68. Moreover, Mical does not teach a data source, as recited in claim 42, being used in the foregoing manner. Additionally, Lum does not correct this deficiency as Lum, by the Office’s own acknowledgement, does not teach or suggest wrap one or more display controls and/or allow the contended “data source” in Lum to behave as recited. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the pending rejection and allowance is earnestly solicited.

The rejection of independent claims 45 and 51 are similarly traversed. Applicant respectfully notes that claims 45 and 51 recite different features which differ from the language of claim 42. No further response is believed to be due, as the Office did not specifically reject the language of claims 45 and 51. Removal of the pending rejection is requested and allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claims 43, 44, 46-50 and 52-57 all depend, respectively from independent claims 42, 45, and 51 which are believed to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 43, 44, 46-50 and 52-57 additionally recite features which are additionally patentable. With regard to claim 43, Applicant notes that the present Action does not particularly address the language appearing in claim 43.

Removal of the pending rejection to claims 43, 44, 46-50 and 52-57 is requested and allowance is solicited.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the Office’s next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: February 28, 2008

By: /s Nathan Grebasch/
Nathan T. Grebasch
Reg. No. 48,600
(509) 755-7262